

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claims 1-5 and 21 stand rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 3 has been canceled.

No new matter has been added.

**II. Objections to the Specification and Claims**

The Examiner has objected to the specification as containing informalities relating to the molding at the rear surface of the PCB. Applicant has amended the specification to correct these informalities.

Additionally, the Examiner has objected to claim 1 as reciting that the image chip is seated in a hollow area formed on a surface of the PCB which the Examiner alleges is incorrect. The Examiner states that the image chip is actually seated in the epoxy resin and not the hollow area of the PCB. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the image chip is seated "in a hollow area formed in a predetermined portion of the PCB" wherein the epoxy resin is molded for the mounting of the image chip. The image chip is thus seated on the epoxy resin within the hollow area of the PCB. This amendment is not made for reasons related to patentability but for purposes of clarification. The Examiner also objected to Claim 3 which has since been cancelled.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above objections be withdrawn.



As claims 2-5 and 21 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, Applicant submits that those claims are allowable for at least the same reasons mentioned above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as none of the art of record teaches or suggests any motivation to combine the teachings of Kitayama with Miyazaki. The mere fact that references might be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of such a combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680 (Fed. Cir. 1990). None of the art of record details any motivation to combine the teachings of Kitayama with Miyazaki. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raffaele A. DeMarco

Registration No.: 54,061

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant